

DCUSA SIG Sub-Group for DIF 71 - Meeting 01

15 January 2024 at 14:00: Microsoft Teams

Attendee	Company
Working Group Members	
Cathy Mulliss [CM]	EON
Clare Wagstaffe [CW]	SSE
Gary Haines [GH]D	British Gas
James Crawford [JC]	Scottish Power
Mark Bellman [MB]	ENWL
Sally Andreasen [SA]	National Grid
Sally Musaka [SM]	SSE
Tim Ellingham [TE]	RWE
Tim Tawse [TT]	Octopus
Wendy Mantle [WM]	SPEN
Code Administrator	
Andy Green [AG] (Chair)	ElectraLink
Mel Kendal [MK] (Technical Secretariat)	ElectraLink
Apologies	
Dave Phillips [DP]	Inspired Energy

1. Administration

- 1.1 The Chair welcomed the members to the meeting.
- 1.2 The Group reviewed the “Competition Law Guidance”. All members agreed to be bound by the Competition Law Guidance for the duration of the meeting.
- 1.3 An action log has been created and all updates are provided in **Appendix A**.

2. Purpose of the Meeting

- 2.1 The Chair explained that the purpose of the meeting is to review and discuss the collated RFI responses within the Working Group and agree next steps.

3. Review of Collated RFI Responses

- 3.1 The Chair invited the Working Group to review and further discuss the collated RFI responses document. This document was presented live on screen and edited during the meeting; an updated version can be found as **Attachment 1**.
- 3.2 The key updated can be found below:
- 3.3 **Question 1**
- 3.4 One member stated that a lot of the time the issue is left down to the Customer who often is not sure what to do with the unpaid energy – it was queried whether it would be down to the Housing Association/DNO/Builder/Customer etc. If it is down to the Customer, the back-billing CoP where only the last 12 months can be backdated – anything further back than this will leave the Supplier with a significant amount of loss.
- 3.5 One respondent provided a timeframe that was unclear to the Working Group and the Secretariat agreed to take an action to follow-up with the respondent for further clarity post-meeting.

ACTION 01/01: The Secretariat to follow up with a respondent (BUUK) to seek further clarity around their response to Q1 of the RFI post-meeting.

- 3.6 One member stated that there does not seem to be any processes in place to identify the issue at the time it occurs, i.e., notifying the Suppliers as soon as possible – this tends to happen further down the line.
- 3.7 Another member stated that having a Generator powering a large number of houses could cause a potential safety issue if the Generator is not fit for purpose for powering a significant number of sites. The Working Group agreed that this example needs to be considered as vulnerable Customers, for example, could be at risk.
- 3.8 The Working Group concluded that several Parties have all experienced the issue. The issue predominantly occurs with new developments which can mean a single Generator is supplying a number of different single properties.
- 3.9 It was also noted by one respondent that they had two instances where Generators were supplying large commercial sites. One respondent also highlighted that these types of installations can also present considerable safety concerns which the solution will need to consider.

3.10 **Question 2**

- 3.11 One member suggested using the Revenue Protection team could be considered, however, this may not be the best/most appropriate approach to an investigation.
- 3.12 It was suggested that it needs to be clear who is responsible for what and the developers need to ensure that they contact the Customer and Supplier/DNO/IDNO at the earliest opportunity if there are any changes to the way in which a site is being developed.
- 3.13 One respondent stated that the Generators may not only supply energy to the developing sites, but also to traffic management and street lighting ahead of residential occupancy. The Working Group agreed that there is clearly a number of health and safety points that need to be considered within this solution.
- 3.14 In response to a respondent, one member queried whether there is a chance that the readings can go into Settlement through the MPAN that has been attached to the meter if manual intervention does not take place – other members stated that yes, there would be a chance of this happening. This would also trigger a DUoS payment.
- 3.15 One member stated that Ofgem are looking to implement a change that allows Suppliers to have a 24-hour metering service as their main concern was that it was taking Suppliers too long (i.e., ¾ days) to get Customers back on Supply.
- 3.16 From a Supplier perspective, it was stated that they would not charge a Customer directly on a building site, these costs would go straight to the developer. Suppliers will only start to charge once the new MPAN has been installed and is live. It was noted that it is unknown whether the developer would pass the charges onto the Customer or not.
- 3.17 Another member stated that as a DNO, they would not quote a developer for the use of a Generator and they would only incur costs to physically connecting to the network.
- 3.18 After further discussion, all Working Group members agreed that it is important to ensure that all health and safety concerns are drawn out and considered within this CP first and foremost.

3.19 **Question 3**

- 3.20 The Working Group noted that the majority of respondents did not provide comments, however, those that did respond stated that they would need additional information of the change to be able to provide further comments.

3.21 **Question 4**

- 3.22 The Working Group noted that the majority of respondents were unable to answer as they did not have appropriate examples, however, those who did respond had a variety of views of which most suggested the responsibility would fall on the DNO/IDNO.
- 3.23 One member provided an example to consider whereby a Customer is left off-Supply and has contacted the DNO after hours – the DNO would then refer them to the developer who they will not be able to contact regarding the Generator out of hours.

4. **Agenda Items for Next Meeting**

- 4.1 The Working Group discussed the next steps, and the following items were captured:

- The Working Group to discuss an educational piece around when certain things should be done.
- The Working Group to discuss a comms piece around who should be notified of changes and why.
- The Working Group to discuss how the process should be regularly maintained (i.e., health and safety implications).
- The Working Group to create an Impact Assessment.

4.2 It was agreed that the points above will be further discussed during the next Working Group meeting and the Secretariat agreed to take an action to gather the above points into a table as a starter for ten.

ACTION 01/02: The Secretariat to create a table as a starter for ten for the Working Group to further discuss during the next meeting.

4.3 CM also agreed to take an action to speak internally to gather additional examples for the Working Group to review during the next meeting and to aid the table created by the Secretariat. Once the Secretariat has received the additional examples, a Doodle Poll will be issued to the Working Group to schedule the next meeting.

ACTION 01/03: CM to speak internally to gather additional examples for the Working Group to review during the next meeting.

5. Any Other Business

5.1 The Chair asked the group whether there was any other business to discuss.

5.2 There were no other items raised.

6. Date of Next Meeting - TBC

6.1 It was agreed that the Secretariat will issue a Doodle Poll to the Working Group to determine the best availability for the next meeting.

ACTION 01/03: The Secretariat to issue a Doodle Poll to the Working Group to determine the best availability for the next meeting.

Appendix 1

New and open actions

Action Ref.	Action	Owner	Update
01/01	The Secretariat to follow up with a respondent (BUUK) to seek further clarity around their response to Q1 of the RFI post-meeting.	Secretariat	New Action.
01/02	The Secretariat to create a table as a starter for ten for the Working Group to further discuss during the next meeting.	Secretariat	New Action.
01/03	CM to speak internally to gather additional examples for the Working Group to review during the next meeting.	CM	New Action.
01/04	The Secretariat to issue a Doodle Poll to the Working Group to determine the best availability for the next meeting.	Secretariat	New Action.

Closed Actions

Action Ref.	Update
	Closed.